DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 618 FL 021 183

AUTHOR Wilkinson, L. David
TITLE Serving the Stronger "Swimmers": A Longitudinal Study of Instructional Approaches for Limited-English-Proficient (LEP) Students with Greater English Ability. Publication No. 92.13.
PUB DATE Jan 93
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Educational Research Association (Austin, TX, January 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Attendance Patterns; *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Students; Elementary Education; Elementary School Students; *English (Second Language); Hispanic Americans; Identification; *Language Dominance; *Language Skills; *Limited English Speaking; Longitudinal Studies; Spanish Speaking; *Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS *Austin Independent School District TX; Hispanic American Students

ABSTRACT

An Austin, Texas, program regarding the identification and placement of Hispanic, limited-English-proficient (LEP) elementary school students is reported. They were assigned to one of three programs: bilingual education; English as a Second Language (ESL); or Language Arts Mastery Process (LAMP). The Austin Independent School District evaluated the effects of the placements based on data from central computer files and personal interviews. After 3 years of study the major findings were as follows: (1) the achievement of LEP students in LAMP exceeded that of students in both the bilingual and ESL programs in the first year, but subsequent years showed no distinct superiority of one program over the other two; (2) attendance and exit rates did not indicate any clear superiority for one program over the others; (3) students' language dominance appears to have changed little since original identification; (4) demographic characteristics of students in all three programs are very similar and have changed little during the 3 years; (5) after a large initial shift in 1989-90 from students being served in the bilingual program to the ESL and LAMP programs, little additional shift occurred in 1990-91; and (6) new procedures may prevent some false identification of students as LEP. Contains 4 references. (LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED357618

SERVING THE STRONGER "SWIMMERS": A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES FOR LIMITED-ENGLISH-PROFICIENT (LEP) STUDENTS WITH GREATER ENGLISH ABILITY

L. David Wilkinson

Austin Independent School District
Austin, Texas

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
Southwest Educational Research Association,
Austin, Texas, January, 1993

FL 021183

Disclaimer

The opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Austin Independent School District or the Office of Research and Evaluation. No official endorsement should be inferred.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Ligon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Publication No. 92.13

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract ii

Introduction 1

Perspective 1

Background 1

Method 2

Evaluation Overview 2

Data Collection 3

Analyses 4

Results 5

Summary 5

Longitudinal Impact 6

Effectiveness of the Three Instructional Approaches 6

Impact of the Policy Change on New-Entry Identification 12

Conclusions 14

Limitations of the Study 15

References 16

Attachment 17

ABSTRACT

In the spring of the 1988-89 school year, the Austin (Texas) Independent School District (AISD) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) came to an agreement regarding the identification and placement of Hispanic, limited-English-proficient (LEP), elementary students who were balanced in their English and Spanish speaking abilities, were dominant in English, or were monolingual in English (language dominances of C, D, and E, respectively). The agreement specified, in part, that AISD would assign Hispanic LEP students identified as C, D, or E as of May 1989, through the Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) process, to one of the following programs:

1. Bilingual education,
2. English as a Second Language (ESL), or
3. Language Arts Mastery Process (LAMP).

The agreement further specified that "Beginning with the 1989-90 school year an evaluation process will be implemented to determine the effectiveness of the three programs for the targeted LEP population," the results from which would be reported to AISD's Board of Trustees and TEA.

AISD's Office of Research and Evaluation (ORE) undertook an evaluation on the effects of the policy change in the 1989-90 school year and conducted follow-up studies in the subsequent two years. Data were collected from District central computer files and from central and campus staff by way of personal interviews. Quantitative analyses were performed by means of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) on the District's mainframe IBM 4381.

After three years of study, the major findings are summarized below:

1. The achievement of LEP CDE students in LAMP exceeded that of students in both the bilingual and ESL programs in the first year. In subsequent years, however, no program showed a distinct superiority over the other two. Because of the small numbers of students tested, however, achievement gains should be interpreted with caution.

2. Other outcome measures--attendance and retention exit rates--did not indicate any clear superiority for one program over the others.

3. The language dominances of the students appear to be have changed little since the students were originally identified, although the apparent lack of change may be because students are not retested yearly.

4. The demographic characteristics of the students served in the bilingual, ESL, and LAMP programs are very similar and have changed little over the past three years.

5. After the large initial shift seen in 1989-90 from students being served in the bilingual program to being served in ESL and LAMP, little additional shift in the percentages of students served occurred among the three programs in 1990-91.

6. Of the 122 students who, in 1989-90, would have become LEP C, D, or E under the 1988-89 guidelines, 77 (63%) were determined not to be LEP. Thus, new procedures may have prevented some false identification of students as LEP.

SERVING THE STRONGER "SWIMMERS": A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES FOR LIMITED-ENGLISH-PROFICIENT (LEP) STUDENTS WITH GREATER ENGLISH ABILITY

INTRODUCTION

Perspective

Along with other school districts across the country, our District is concerned with the achievement of its LEP students. A variety of models or instructional options for teaching LEP students exist and are currently being used in many school districts. However, despite many years of research and evaluation, the national debate about the efficacy of different instructional approaches continues unabated, nor have recent reviews (Lam, 1992; Meyer & Fienberg, 1992) about the adequacy of bilingual education evaluations, particularly those by local districts, provided any comfort to local educators, who it seems are left the task of making the best choices they can and trying to evaluate those choices.

If school-based staff are best able to make instructional decisions for students, as is currently being argued by proponents of school-based management, then school staff ought to be able to decide how the education of limited-English-proficient (LEP) students would best be furthered. That contention led to an agreement between our urban, Texas school district and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) that permitted an all-English instructional option, besides English as a Second Language (ESL) and bilingual instruction, to be furnished to LEP students with stronger English skills, if that were the choice of the campus Language Proficiency Assessment Committees (LPAC's), and provided that the District evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional options. This paper presents the results of a three-year study of the effects of this policy change.

Background

On March 24, 1989, the Austin Independent School District (AISD) and the Texas Education Agency (TEA) came to an agreement regarding the identification and placement of elementary, Hispanic, LEP students whose language dominance tests resulted in a classification of C (bilingual), D (English dominant), or E (English monolingual) on or before May 1989. This agreement is expressed in a March 31, 1989, letter to TEA's director of programs from AISD's director of intergovernmental relations (attached). The agreement specified, in part, that AISD would assign Hispanic LEP students identified as C, D, or E as of May 1989, through the Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) process, to one of the following programs:

1. Bilingual education,
2. English as a Second Language (ESL), or
3. Language Arts Mastery Process (LAMP).

In other words, the agreement permitted these "old" C, D, and E students, the stronger English speakers, to be assigned by their LPAC's to an appropriate instructional program--bilingual, the previously suggested option for all these students, or either of two alternative programs not previously available, ESL or LAMP, an oral language development program.

The agreement further specified, as stated in the March 31 letter, that "Beginning with the 1989-90 school year an evaluation process will be implemented to determine the effectiveness of the three programs for the targeted LEP population," the results from which would be reported to the Board of Trustees and TEA.

Finally, the agreement prescribed that new-entry students who would formerly have been identified as C, D, or E were to be screened by the LPAC's to determine if they were actually LEP or were instead not LEP but educationally disadvantaged.

METHOD

Evaluation Overview

As mandated, an evaluation was implemented in 1989-90 to determine the effectiveness of the three instructional options (bilingual education, ESL, and LAMP) available to the "old" CDE students. Not specifed for evaluation, but of interest, were the effects of the new identification procedures. Therefore, the 1989-90 evaluation was organized around two key questions:

(1) How effective were the bilingual, ESL, and LAMP programs for the "old" CDE students, and

(2) What was the impact of new procedures on the classification of new-entry CDE students?

Questions related to effectiveness concerned the number of students placed in each of the instructional programs, why the students were placed in the programs (i.e., student characteristics), how students in each program scored on standardized achievement tests, whether there were differences in attendance or retention rates for students in the three programs, and how many eligible students exited the programs.

Questions concerning the new classification procedures focused on the number of "new" C, D, and E students identified relative to the number of non-LEP, educationally disadvantaged students, and the impact on achievement and instructional program type of the reclassification.

Follow-up studies in 1990-91 and 1991-92 focused on the longitudinal impact--change in language dominance, movement among the instructional options, attendance and retention rates, and achievement--of the three approaches on the "old" CDE students. The impact of new classification procedures was examined only in 1989-90.

In examining outcomes for LEP students in bilingual, ESL, and LAMP, it is important to recognize that *students were not randomly assigned to groups*, but instead were placed in a group by the LPAC's based on specific characteristics such as language ability and achievement. Thus, **while it is possible to describe students' success after participating in each program, it was not possible to attribute any difference found solely to the program in which they were served.** Differences in the characteristics of the students served may also have contributed to differences in student success.

Data Collection

Data for the 1989-90 study and subsequent follow-up studies in 1990-91 and 1991-92 were collected from a variety of sources:

- The LANG file, the LEP master file maintained on the District's mainframe computer was the official source of all information about LEP students--language dominance, instructional program received, number of years in the bilingual program, etc.

- A file containing the same information as the LANG File but only for the "old" CDE students was saved.

- Demographic and outcome information for the "old" CDE students were obtained via use of ORE's GENeric Evaluation SYStem (GENESYS). GENESYS also utilizes the Report on Program Effectiveness (ROPE) procedure to compare predicted to actual achievement. See description below.

- Personal interviews were conducted with about a one-third sample of the campus LPAC chairpersons to gather opinion information about the placement and progress of LEP CDE students in 1989-90.

- A group interview was conducted with the administrative supervisor of bilingual/ESL education and bilingual instructional coordinators to obtain opinion information from a central perspective as to the effectiveness and appropriateness of the program changes in 1989-90.

GENESYS and ROPE

The GENeric Evaluation SYStem (GENESYS) is a tool developed by ORE to streamline data collection and evaluation through the use of computer technology. GENESYS uses custom-written SAS computer programs to access many AISD student databases and produce statistical information about achievement, attendance, discipline, and dropout rates for specified populations . GENESYS can be run for any group of students identified by means of AISD's permanent 7-digit identification number. GENESYS produces four standard listings: a program summary, an executive summary, data by student, and a program description. Three optional printouts, cross-program comparison charts, two-way crosstabulation tables on selected variables, and individual ROPE residuals, may be requested by the user. See Ligon and Baenen (1989) and Wilkinson and Spano (1991).

A portion of the GENESYS program called the Report on Program Effectiveness (ROPE) uses regression analysis to predict the scores for groups of students on standardized tests. ROPE is a series of statistical analyses that answers the question, "How do the achievement gains of a program's students compare with those of other AISD students of the same previous achievement levels and background characteristics?" ROPE predicts achievment scores for the group of students who have both pre- and posttest scores on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS), the Tests of Achievement and Proficiency (TAP), or the Norm-Referenced Assessment Program for Texas (NAPT), depending on grade level and year of administration. Predictions are based on previous achievement levels and background characteristics including sex, ethnicity, age, low-income status, family income, transfer status, desegregation status of the school attended, and pupil-teacher ratio of the

school. Predictions are compared to the students' actual scores. The difference between the predicted and actual score is called the ROPE residual, which is based on a grade equivalent (GE) score scale. If students' ROPE residual scores are far enough above or below zero to achieve statistical significance, they are said to have either "exceeded predicted gain" or to be "below predicted gain." Nonsignificant residual scores are classified as "achieved predicted gain."

Questionnaire for Parents of Hispanic Students

Part of the new procedures for screening incoming Hispanic, LEP students called for the classroom teacher to administer the "Questionnaire for Parents of Hispanic Students" to the parents of students scoring as Non-English Speaking (NES) and Non-Spanish Speaking (NSS) or Limited English Speaking (LES) and Non-Spanish Speaking (NSS) on the IDEA Test of Oral Language Proficiency (see below). The results of the questionnaire were to be used by the LPAC to determine if the student were LEP or not LEP.

On the "Questionnaire for Parents of Hispanic Students," a teacher could recommend that a student be classified as "not LEP and would benefit from compensatory/remedial services." The teacher could also specify which services might benefit the student. A decision was made by program and evaluation staff in September, 1989, to record this recommendation on the LANG Masterfile. The file was modified accordingly, and the "educationally disadvantaged" designation was to be recorded throughout the 1989-90 school year.

IDEA Test of Oral Language Proficiency

The IDEA is the District's measure of oral language proficiency. Rather than scores, the test generates classifications as follows:

FES = Fluent English Speaking
FSS = Fluent Spanish Speaking
NSS = Non-Spanish Speaking
LES = Limited English Speaking
LSS = Limited Spanish Speaking

Analyses

1989-90

Each of the three instructional groups was run through GENESYS, which produced ROSE results--pretest GE, posttest GE, predicted GE, actual gain, residual, and statistical significance-- in reading for each group, by grade level. GENESYS also supplied demographic information (sex, age, and low-income status), and attendance and retention rates for the students in each program.

Computer programs using the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) software were applied to the LEP File on the District's mainframe IBM 4341 (now 4381) to determine instructional program received, language dominance, and differential exit rates for students in the programs.

Interview information was summarized for main ideas.

In 1989-90, the differences between predicted and actual GE scores (residuals) were standardized by weighting them by the number of students at each grade, and then averaging across grades. The averages for the three programs were then compared to determine if there were differences among the programs. The average differences across grades for the 1989-90 bilingual, ESL, and LAMP programs were -.0036, -.1769, and .0818, respectively.

1990-91 and 1991-92

In both follow-up years, 1990-91 and 1991-92, the program status of the 894 "old" CDE students (classified as of May, 1989) identified in 1989-90 was determined from the LANG file (the master LEP file) as of the end of the school year.

In each year, three computer files were created of the students served in the bilingual, ESL, and LAMP programs--173, 225, and 125, and 141, 201, and 78 students in 1990-91 and 1991-92, respectively. These files were run through GENESYS to obtain demographic, progress, and achievement information about the students served by the three programs.

Additional analyses were performed using the LANG file to ascertain the students' language dominances and grade levels.

RESULTS

Summary

The major findings of this three-year study are summarized below:

1. The achievement of LEP CDE students in LAMP exceeded that of students in both the bilingual and ESL programs in the first year. In subsequent years, however, no program showed a distinct superiority over the other two. Because of the small numbers of students tested, however, achievement gains should be interpreted with caution.

2. Other outcome measures--attendance and retention rates--do not indicate any clear superiority for one program over the others.

3. The language dominances of the students appear to be have changed little since the students were originally identified, although the apparent lack of change may be because students are not retested yearly.

4. The demographic characteristics of the students served in the bilingual, ESL, and LAMP programs are very similar and have changed little over the past three years.

5. After the large initial shift seen in 1989-90 from students being served in the bilingual program to being served in ESL and LAMP, little additional shift in the percentages of students served occurred among the three programs in 1990-91.

6. Of the 122 students who, in 1989-90, would have become LEP C, D, or E under the 1988-89 guidelines, 77 (63%) were determinad not to be LEP. Thus, new procedures may have prevented some false identification of students as LEP.

Longitudinal Impact

In 1990-91, of the original 894 students, 542 (61%) remained active in the elementary grades, i.e., had not left the District and were still receiving services. Of these 542 students, 523 were served in the bilingual, ESL, and LAMP programs in 1990-91. See below.

894 "old" CDE students in 1989-90

less 86 students who became inactive in 1990-91

less 96 students who were promoted to middle school in 1990-91

less 122 students who exited the program

less 48 students who were denied services by their parents

---

542 "old" CDE students in elementary grades K-6 in 1990-91

less 19 students receiving special education or modified instruction

---

523 "old" CDE students in bilingual, ESL, or LAMP programs in 1990-91

By 1991-92, of the original 894 students, 432 (48%) remained active in the elementary grades, 189 (21%) have been promoted to middle school, and 105 (12%) have exited the bilingual program. Of the 432 students still active, 420 were served in the bilingual, ESL, and LAMP programs in 1991-92. See below.

894 "old" CDE students in 1989-90

less 110 students who became inactive since 1989-90

less 189 students who were promoted to middle school since 1989-90

less 105 students who exited the program

less 58 students who were denied services by their parents

---

432 "old" CDE students in elementary grades K-6 in 1991-92

less 12 students receiving special education or modified instruction

---

420 "old" CDE students in bilingual, ESL, or LAMP programs in 1991-92

Effectiveness of the Three Instructional Approaches

Figure 1 presents the numbers of "old" CDE students in each of the three programs, by grade level, in 1991-92 compared with the previous two years. None of the "old" CDE students was still in kindergarten, and very few were in first grade, indicating that students are being promoted.

FIGURE 1
NUMBER OF "OLD" CDE IN BILINGUAL, ESL, AND LAMP, BY GRADE LEVEL, 1991-92 COMPARED WITH TWO PREVIOUS YEARS

GRADE	1989-90* #	1989-90* %	1990-91 #	1990-91 %	1991-92 #	1991-92 %
K	104	13.0	2	.4	0	0
1	222	27.6	109	20.8	4	1.0
2	142	17.7	145	27.7	93	22.1
3	120	14.9	101	19.3	135	32.1
4	103	12.8	76	14.5	90	21.4
5	87	10.8	77	14.7	77	18.3
6	25	3.1	13	2.5	21	5.0
TOTAL	803	99.9	523	99.9	420	99.9

* Includes only those students served in bilingual, ESL, and LAMP programs; 29 other students were inactive on the LANG file, and 62 were in other LEP programs.

Figure 2 shows the language dominances of the "old" CDE students for 1991-92 and the previous three years. **The percentages of students in each of the language dominance categories have changed little over the four years,** which suggests that either students are not changing in their English ability or that because students are not retested yearly, there has been no recorded change in their "official" language dominance as reflected on the LANG file.

FIGURE 2
LANGUAGE DOMINANCE OF "OLD" CDE STUDENTS, 1991-92 COMPARED WITH THREE PREVIOUS YEARS

DOMINANCE	1988-89 #	1988-89 %	1989-90* #	1989-90* %	1990-91** #	1990-91** %	1991-92*** #	1991-92*** %
C	156	17.4	143	17.4	151	18.9	145	18.8
D	236	26.4	226	27.6	214	26.9	227	29.4
E	502	56.2	451	55.0	432	54.2	400	51.8
TOTAL	894	100.0	820	100.0	797	100.0	772	100.0

* Dominance was not recorded on the central file for 74 students.
** Dominance was not recorded on the file for 1 student; 10 students had language dominances of A or B; 86 students became inactive in 1990-91.
*** Dominance was not recorded on the file for 2 students; 10 students had a language dominance of B; 110 students have become inactive since 1989-90.

NOTE: Students promoted to middle school, beginning in 1990-91, are included in these counts.

Figure 3 shows that **across the three programs the demographic characteristics of the students were very similar and have changed little from 1989-90 to 1990-91 to 1991-92.**

- The percentages of male and female students were almost equal. The one exception was LAMP in 1991-92; larger percentages of male students were served than in the previous two years or in the other programs in any year.
- About one third of the LEP students in each group in each year were overage for their grade.
- Very similar high percentages of the LEP students in each group in each year were from low-income families.

FIGURE 3
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF "OLD" CDE STUDENTS IN THREE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, 1990-91 COMPARED WITH 1989-90

	PROGRAM								
CHARACTERISTIC	BILINGUAL			ESL			LAMP		
	89-90 (N=276)	90-91 (N=173)	91-92 (N=141)	89-90 (N=322)	90-91 (N=225)	91-92 (N=201)	89-90 (N=205)	90-91 (N=125)	91-92 (N=
Sex									
Male	# 144	92	77	169	119	108	105	62	45
	% 52	53	55	52	53	54	51	50	58
Female	# 132	81	64	153	106	93	100	63	33
	% 48	47	45	48	47	46	49	50	42
Overage for Grade	# 105	53	43	111	72	70	73	36	24
	% 38	31	30	34	32	35	36	29	31
Low Income	# 250	157	133	293	201	180	184	115	72
	% 91	91	94	91	89	90	90	92	92

Figure 4 compares the numbers of "old" CDE students served in each of the three programs over the past four years.

- The percentage of students served in the bilingual program decreased by over one half from 1988-89 to 1989-90 but remained constant the following two years.
- The percentage of students in ESL has increased each year, more than doubling from 1988-89 to 1991-92.
- LAMP was not an available program option in 1988-89. The first year in which it was, 1989-90, saw 25% of the students being served. The percentage served decreased in 1990-91 and again in 1991-92.
- Almost the same small percentage of students received other programs in each of the four years.

FIGURE 4
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM RECEIVED BY "OLD" CDE STUDENTS, 1991-92 COMPARED WITH THREE PREVIOUS YEARS

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM	1988-89*		1989-90*		1990-91**		1991-92***	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Bilingual	607	74	272	33	173	32	141	33
ESL	185	23	320	39	225	42	201	47
LAMP	0	0	205	25	125	23	78	18
OTHER****	26	3	21	3	19	4	12	3
TOTAL	818	100	818	100	542	101	432	101

* No program was recorded on the central file for one or the other of the years 1988-89 and 1989-90 for 76 students.

** In 1990-91, of the original 894 "old" CDE students, 86 became inactive, 96 were promoted to middle school, 48 were denied service by their parents, and 122 exited the program.

*** By 1991-92, of the original 894 "old" CDE students, 110 had become inactive, 189 had been promoted to middle school, 58 had been denied service by their parents, and 105 had exited the program.

**** Special education or modified instruction

Figure 5 shows the attendance and retention rates for the students in each of the three programs over the past three years.

- Attendance rates were high for all three groups across the three years. Slight increases and decreases have occurred across the eight semesters tracked; over the whole time period, the attendance of students in ESL and LAMP has improved by one percentage point, while the attendance of bilingual students has not changed.

- Almost no students in the three programs were retained in 1991-92. Smaller percentages of students have been retained each year since 1989-90 in all three programs (except LAMP where no students were retained in either of the past two years).

FIGURE 5
ATTENDANCE AND RETENTION RATES FOR "OLD" CDE STUDENTS IN THREE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, 1991-92 COMPARED WITH TWO PREVIOUS YEARS

PROGRAM YEAR	PROGRESS INDICATOR			BILINGUAL FALL	BILINGUAL SPRING	ESL FALL	ESL SPRING	LAMP FALL	LAMP SPRING
1989-90	ATTENDANCE	89-90	#	276	276	322	322	205	205
			%	95.6	95.6	96.4	95.9	96.1	95.6
		88-89	#	231	234	274	279	176	178
			%	95.9	94.5	95.6	94.2	95.4	94.4
1990-91	ATTENDANCE	90-91	#	173	173	224	275	125	125
			%	96.5	95.6	96.8	96.3	97.0	95.9
		89-90	#	173	173	225	225	125	125
			%	95.6	95.7	96.6	96.0	96.2	95.7
1991-92	ATTENDANCE	91-92	#	141	141	200	201	78	78
			%	97.0	95.9	96.8	96.6	96.6	96.4
		90-91	#	138	136	198	199	78	77
			%	96.8	95.8	96.9	96.6	96.7	95.4
1989-90	RETENTION			3.6%		4.3%		4.4%	
1990-91	RETENTION			1.7%		1.8%		0%	
1991-92	RETENTION			0%		.5%		0%	

Figure 6 presents the Report on Program Effectiveness (ROPE) results in reading for the "old" CDE students in the three instructional programs in each of the three program years.

- Overall, from about one third to about one half of the students were tested in both spring 1991 and spring 1992. Within grade level, however, the numbers of students tested were very small, and achievement gains should be interpreted with caution.

- Students' mean posttest grade equivalent scores in the three programs were very similar in grades 2-5 in 1989-90; at grade 6, however, the mean GE exceeded those of students in ESL and LAMP by .9 and 1.0 years, respectively. In 1990-91 and 1991-92, students' mean posttest scores in the three programs were similar in grades 2-6, although in 1991-92 students in the ESL program scored as well as or better than students in the other two programs at each grade level. The biggest differences among the 1990-91 and 1991-92 programs were at grade 6 (where the smallest numbers of students were tested and the largest variability would be expected).

- The numbers of students on whom the ROPE analysis was performed were too small to determine whether students achieved their predicted levels at most grade levels across the programs. At a few grades and programs, notably grade 3 of ESL, students made gains at predicted levels, indicating no impact of the program on tested achievement. Only in 1989-90 at grade 4 in ESL did any group of students score more poorly than predicted.

FIGURE 6
ROPE RESULTS IN READING FOR "OLD" CDE STUDENTS
IN THREE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, 1991-92 COMPARED WITH TWO PREVIOUS YEARS

1991-92 PROGRAM	GRADE	N	PRETEST GE 1991	POSTTEST GE 1992	ACTUAL GAIN	OVER/UNDER ACTUAL GE	PROGRAM EFFECTIVE-NESS
Bilingual	2	9	1.5	2.7	1.2	0.3	*
	3	15	2.0	2.8	0.9	-.2	*
	4	6	2.8	3.4	0.6	0.0	*
	5	13	3.3	4.4	1.1	-.1	*
	6	3	4.0	4.1	0.1	-.8	*
ESL	2	16	1.7	2.7	1.0	0.0	*
	3	43	2.1	3.0	0.8	-.1	0
	4	25	2.7	3.4	0.8	0.0	*
	5	20	3.4	4.7	1.3	0.1	*
	6	4	4.1	5.3	1.2	0.4	*
LAMP	2	17	1.9	2.6	0.8	-.2	*
	3	8	1.9	2.6	0.6	-.3	*
	4	10	2.7	3.4	0.7	-.1	*
	5	7	3.2	4.0	0.8	-.5	*
	6	1	2.3	4.6	2.3	1.1	*
1990-91 PROGRAM	**GRADE**	**N**	**PRETEST GE**	**POSTTEST GE**	**ACTUAL GAIN**	**OVER/UNDER ACTUAL GE**	**PROGRAM EFFECTIVE-NESS**
BILINGUAL	2	37	1.1	2.0	0.9	-.1	0
	3	12	1.8	2.6	0.8	0.0	*
	4	17	2.5	3.3	0.8	-.1	*
	5	11	3.4	4.2	0.9	-.2	*
	6	2	3.6	4.5	0.9	0.0	*
ESL	2	32	1.1	2.0	0.9	-.1	0
	3	31	2.0	2.8	0.9	-.1	0
	4	23	2.7	3.2	0.8	-.4	*
	5	20	3.2	4.4	0.6	.1	*
	6	6	3.7	3.9	1.2	-.7	*
LAMP	2	21	1.2	2.3	1.1	.1	*
	3	15	1.9	2.7	0.8	-.1	*
	4	8	2.6	2.7	0.4	-.5	*
	5	15	3.0	3.0	0.7	-.3	*
	6	1	4.0	3.7	0.8	.1	*
1989-90 PROGRAM	**GRADE**	**N**	**PRETEST GE**	**POSTTEST GE**	**ACTUAL GAIN**	**OVER/UNDER ACTUAL GE**	**PROGRAM EFFECTIVE-NESS**
BILINGUAL	2	14	1.0	1.9	0.9	0.1	*
	3	24	1.9	2.7	0.8	0.0	*
	4	19	2.6	3.4	0.8	-0.1	*
	5	17	3.0	3.9	0.9	-.2	*
	6	6	4.0	5.4	1.4	0.7	*
ESL	2	36	1.2	2.0	0.9	0.0	0
	3	32	2.0	2.8	0.8	0.0	0
	4	29	2.7	3.3	0.6	-.4	-
	5	22	3.1	4.1	1.0	-.1	*
	6	6	4.5	4.5	0.0	-.7	*
LAMP	2	25	1.4	2.1	0.7	0.1	*
	3	16	1.8	2.9	1.1	0.3	*
	4	15	2.4	3.1	0.8	-.1	*
	5	12	2.9	3.8	0.9	-.2	*
	6	6	3.3	4.4	1.1	0.2	*

* Number of students is too small for analysis
= Achieved predicted score
- Below predicted score

Impact of the Policy Change on New-Entry Identification

"New" CDE Students - 1989-90 Compared to 1988-89

In 1988-89, 190 students who were new entries to AISD became LEP C, D, or E students. In 1989-90, **122 students who were new to AISD would have qualified as LEP C, D, or E under the 1988-89 rules**. However, with the addition of the parent questionnaire, **45 of the 122 (37%) became LEP C, D, or E students while 77 (63%) were determined to be not LEP** (66 at grades pre-K through 1 and 11 at grades 2-4). Overall, the number of LEP new entries who became C, D, or E dropped from 190 in 1988-89 to 45 in 1989-90.

The IDEA scores of the 1989-90 new C, D, or E entries who became LEP compared to those who did not become LEP are shown below.

Status	IDEA English			IDEA Spanish		
	FES	LES	NES	FSS	LSS	NSS
LEP CDE # (N=45)	8	35	2	7	6	32
	18%	78%	4%	16%	13%	71%
Not LEP # (N=77)	0	70	7	0	25	52
	0%	91%	9%	0%	32%	68%

FES = Fluent English Speaking
LES = Limited English Speaking
FSS = Fluent Spanish Speaking
LSS = Limited Spanish Speaking
NSS = Non-Spanish Speaking

Differences in English ability based on the IDEA are not large. At first glance, it seems puzzling that students fluent in English (FES) would become LEP and that no students fluent in English became not LEP. However, only students at grades 2-6 with low achievement scores became LEP under the old system. All eight students who fit this description were made LEP in 1989-90 (the parent questionnaire was not used to make any of these students not LEP). If these eight students are excluded, 94% of the students who became LEP scored LES and 5% scored NES.

It is somewhat surprising that some students who scored non-English-speaking (NES) on the IDEA on the IDEA became not LEP. Parent questionnaire responses were not available for review. It may be these students were shy or uncomfortable with the testing situation and knew more English than the IDEA scores indicated.

In terms of Spanish ability, a larger percentage of those who became LEP (16%) scored fluent in Spanish (FSS) than those who became not LEP (0%). It is surprising that over two thirds (71%) of those who became LEP scored non-Spanish speaking (NSS) on the IDEA (similar to the not-LEP group).

Not LEP and "Educationally Disadvantaged" Students

In 1989-90, a new procedure was adopted in which to designate students who were not LEP but were educationally disadvantaged on the LANG File. However, a check of the file indicated few students were designated as such.

Among the 77 "not LEP" students:

- o 40 (52%) received pre-K services,
- o 7 (9%) received services from Chapter 1 schoolwide projects, and
- o 30 (39%) **received no compensatory/remedial services.**

It should be noted that students may have been served in ways not recorded on central computer files, e.g., tutoring. **However, it appears that many of these students received no formal compensatory services.**

Impact of Classifying "New" CDE Students in 1989-90 with the IDEA and the "Questionnaire for Parents of Hispanic Students" on Instructional Program Type

Of the "new" C, D, and E students:

- o 76% received bilingual education,
- o 24% received ESL,
- o 0% received special education,
- o 0% received modified instruction.

Instructions to the schools were that students who became LEP in the C, D, or E categories should receive bilingual education. However, it appears 24% received ESL through a parent denial of bilingual service.

Through interviews with LPAC coordinators, a majority of schools (14 of 17) reported that the additional information collected through the parent questionnaire resulted in better identification of LEP students. Specifically, those interviewed stated that the additional information:

- Resulted in more accurate decisions (particularly with borderline cases),
- Provided more accurate information that testing for pre-K and K, and
- Provided confirmation of teacher perceptions.

Six of the schools reported that the process of using the parent questionnaire went well, while 11 reported mixed results. Concerns were expressed with the clarity of the forms, the additional paper work involved, and the difficulty of contacting parents.

In an interview, bilingual coordinators indicated that the questionnaire would not be used to classify students in 1990-91 (although it could be used to help determine student dominance). Because this could result in students becoming LEP who are really not, revising the dominance chart and continuing to classify students based on the questionnaire was suggested as the better course.

In summary, the addition of the parent questionnaire caused 77 students to become not LEP who would have previously. Most of these students were at the pre-K, and 1 level. In addition, 45 students did become LEP C, D, or E. Thus, the parent questionnaire may have prevented some students from having falsely identified as LEP. One problem is that fewer of these students were placed in compensatory programs for disadvantaged students that would be expected; another is that there is no formal mechanism for reviewing their progress or changing their LEP status subsequently.

CONCLUSIONS

While there are currently many programs to serve LEP students, there is no consensus among researchers and educators on what approaches are most successful, particularly with students with greater English-speaking ability. This study contributes to the growing body of national research on appropriate approaches for LEP students. **While the results of this study do not clearly indicate superiority of any of the program options tried, neither do they support TEA's position that all Hispanic LEP students, regardless of English ability, should be served in bilingual programs.**

In the last analysis, this study may say more about the relative sameness of instructional approaches to serving LEP students (in AISD and probably other districts) regardless of the label applied to the program than about their relative effectiveness. The apparent lack of distinctive differences among the groups in student outcomes may also be a function of the strict guidelines under which students are identified for service and under which they exit. Study results suggest that school staffs can make reasonable decisions about appropriate instructional approaches. The point may be that more flexible approaches are needed to meet the varying needs of the different types of LEP students.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

As previously noted, the main limitations of this study arise from the necessity to accept treatment groups as constituted by the decision making of the LPAC's. Because students could not be randomly assigned to bilingual, ESL, and LAMP groups, it was not possible from the outset to attribute differences among the groups solely to differences in instructional approach. In addition to possible variations among LPAC's in the assignment process, as well as the availability of the program options (LAMP was not offered on every campus), preexisting differences among students in language ability and achievement levels may have accounted for differences in program outcomes.

The study was also limited by its outcome measures, which were selected on the basis of ready access. Classes were not observed to detect differences in instructional approach, nor was additional achievement testing conducted. With approximately one half of the students in one of the instructional options not tested, fewer student scores than needed were available for analysis.

Because of available resources, the follow-up studies in 1990-91 and 1991-92 were more limited in scope than the first year's evaluation. Consequently, promising directions for study, such as the effect of changes in classification procedures, could not be continued.

Finally, no additional cohorts of "new" (post-1989) CDE students were tracked or compared with the original "old" CDE student cohort. Analyses of this type may have provided a useful contrast to findings about the original cohort. For example, informal reports indicated that the LAMP instructional option was being offered with less frequency in the years after 1989-90. Not known is whether this program was less successful with LEP student of stronger English ability of whether it simply lost support as an instructional option districtwide.

REFERENCES

Lam, T. C. M. (1992). Review of practices and problems in the evaluation of bilingual education. Review of Educational Research, 62, 181-203.

Ligon, G., & Baenen, N. (1989, April). Evaluation methodology for the 90's: A GENeric Evaluation SYStem (GENESYS) (Publication No. 89.16). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Meyer, M. M., & Fienberg, S. E. (Eds.). (1992). Assessing evaluation studies: The case of bilingual education strategies. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Wilkinson, D., & Spano, S. G. (1991, July). GENESYS 1990-91: Selected program evaluations (Publication 90.39). Austin, TX: Austin Independent School District, Office of Research and Evaluation.

ATTACHMENT
(Page 1 of 2)

ORE DISTRICT PRIORITIES
APR 5 1989

Austin Independent School District

Department of Intergovernmental Relations

March 31, 1989

APR 3 1989
A.I.S.D.
BILINGUAL/ESL EDUCATION

Roberto Villarreal
Director of Programs
Compensatory/Bilingual/Migrant Funding and Compliance
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701

Dear Roberto:

As per our discussion on March 24, 1989, the Austin ISD and the Texas Education Agency agree to the following procedures for limited English proficient (LEP) students who are identified as C (bilingual), D (Dominant English) or E (monolingual English).

Currently Identified LEP Students

The Austin ISD will assign each of the Hispanic C,D, or E limited English proficient students, through the Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC) process, to one of the following programs in the elementary schools:

1. Bilingual education program,
2. English as a Second Language (ESL) program, or
3. Language Arts Mastery Process (LAMP) program.

Beginning with the 1989-90 school year an evaluation process will be implemented to determine the effectiveness of the three programs for the targeted LEP population. The results will be reported to the Board of Trustees and the Texas Education Agency.

New Entry Students (PK-6) 1989-90

Beginning with the 1989-90 school year, a new step will be added to the LEP identification process for Hispanic elementary students whose language proficiency tests result in a C,D, or E language dominance classification. Using all information available, for new entries in grades PK-6, including home language surveys, test scores and other measures, the LPAC will determine if each of the

5555 North Lamar, Bldg. H Austin, Texas 78751-1001 512/458-1291

Letter to: Roberto Villareal
From: Lee Laws
Page 2

students, in question, is limited English proficient or is educationally disadvantaged. If the student is determined to be educationally disadvantaged the student will be provided compensatory/remedial services as applicable in grades K-6. At the Pre-K level, students that the LPAC determines to be LEP, using these criteria, will be served in the bilingual program.

Unless we hear to the contrary within two (2) weeks of the date of this letter, the procedures outlined above will serve as the agreement between the Austin ISD and the Texas Education Agency.

Sincerely,

Lee Laws

Lee Laws
Director

cc: Dr. Gonzalo Garza
Dr. Terry Bishop
LaVonne Rogers
Dr. Jose Lopez
Carmen Gamboa

RECEIVED
APR 3 1989
A.I.S.D.
BILINGUAL/ESL EDUCATION